

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

BENJAMIN ESPINOSA,	)	3:17-CV-0710-MMD-CLB
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u></b>
	)	
vs.	)	March 5, 2020
	)	
JAMES DZURENDA, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE CARLA BALDWIN, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: LISA MANN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

**MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:**

Before the court is plaintiff's motion to compel (ECF No. 65). Defendants opposed the motion (ECF No. 71).

Plaintiff's motion to compel (ECF No. 65) is **GRANTED**. In their opposition, defendants cite to plaintiff's untimeliness; however, they fail to address their own extensive untimeliness in answering discovery which necessitated an extension of discovery and which generated a motion to compel after plaintiff apparently served this particular request for production twice. In fact, defendants never address whether or not they have ever answered this request for production of documents. In their opposition defendants merely state: "It appears, Defendants, inadvertently, neglected to respond to this Request for Production in their efforts to timely respond to the plethora of Plaintiff's other discovery requests." Just because plaintiff is very active in discovery does not mean that defendants may ignore some discovery requests - even inadvertently. Defendants shall respond to plaintiff's request for production on or before **March 20, 2020**.

Plaintiff motion to stay defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 74) is **DENIED**. However, plaintiff shall be granted an extension of time to **Friday, April 3, 2020** to file an opposition.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DEBRA K. KEMPI, CLERK

By:                     /s/                      
Deputy Clerk